

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 300

HE 014 691

AUTHOR McMahon, Linda
TITLE Independent College Interest Group Influence on State Policy.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Independent Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 62p.; Some tables may not reproduce well.
AVAILABLE FROM National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., 601, Washington, DC 20036 (\$10.00).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Group Dynamics; Higher Education; *Lobbying; *Political Influences; Power Structure; *Private Colleges; *Professional Associations; *Public Policy; *State Aid; State Legislation; Statistical Studies

ABSTRACT

The increase in the 1970's state aid to independent colleges and the doubling of interest groups representing independent colleges in the states (39 state associations by 1978) are examined, and a demonstrable relationship is found between these facts. It is argued that the chief factor motivating states to act on behalf of independent colleges is influence from interest groups representing independent colleges at the state level and that the strength of interest groups affects the amount of aid appropriated to independent colleges. Interest group strength is measured in terms of the amount of money the group spends, the degree of internal unit within the organization, quality of leadership, skillful use of strategy, and the variety of tactics used to influence policy. Case studies of selected states offer a vehicle for evaluation of the relationship between policy output and interest group operations. A summary of the findings of a multivariate statistical study of interest group influence is presented. Factors describing group operations in the different states provide examples for action in other settings. Data tables show: average tuition in public and independent colleges from 1956 to 1975, in current and 1974 dollars; characteristics of private colleges contributing to quality and diversity (small enrollment, single-sex, predominantly black, selective, or highly-ranked); states without interest groups or in which groups were formed after passing aid legislation; and a profile of independent colleges in six unnamed states. A list of references is included. (Author/MSE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED213300

Independent College Interest Group Influence on State Policy

Linda McMahon

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the original organization
preparing it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproducibility only.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent those of
ERIC or the Department of Education.



An Occasional Research Report
from the State-National Information Network

National Institute of Independent
Colleges and Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20036

©1981, by the National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities. Additional copies of this issue are available at \$10.00 each from:

NIICU
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20036

INDEPENDENT COLLEGE
INTEREST GROUP INFLUENCE
ON STATE POLICY

by

LINDA McMAHON

Dean of Student Services and
Professor of History and Political Science
Marymount College of Virginia

NOVEMBER 1981

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF INDEPENDENT
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Washington, DC 20036

FOREWORD

State support for public higher education led to increasing pressures on independent colleges and universities during the 1970s. This support enabled public institutions to maintain tuition rates well below those charged by independent colleges and universities with the resulting tuition gap adversely affecting the ability of independent institutions to compete with their public counterparts. Rising costs and pressures to keep the tuition gap from growing threatened the survival of many independent colleges and universities. This ability to compete was especially important as the number of college-age youth began to decline.

Recognizing their common plight, independent colleges and universities joined during the 1970s in a growing number of states to argue their case for public support. Thirty-nine state associations of independent colleges and universities were formed by 1978 for the purpose of influencing state policies toward higher education. This nearly doubled the number that were organized at the outset of the decade. The ability of these associations to influence state aid for independent colleges and universities is an important issue in the outlook for restoring the balance of competition in higher education.

Linda McMahon examined this issue in her doctoral dissertation completed in December 1980 for the PH.D. in Education Policy at the George Washington University. Controlling for other factors, her research shows the positive contribution of these associations to state appropriations for independent colleges and universities. She summarizes the research in this monograph and describes why some associations have been more successful than others. Her conclusions are based on estimates of a state expenditures model, with appropriations to independent colleges and universities as the dependent measure, and a series of case studies in six states.

The research is approached from an interdisciplinary perspective examining a broad range of economic, social, and political factors and their influence on state appropriations for independent colleges and universities. The findings should be of interest to the membership of existing and prospective state associations of independent colleges and universities and to those concerned with the general topic of interest groups and their contribution to the policy development process. This monograph is written for those who wish to focus on policy issues.

Arvil V. Adams
Research Professor of Education
Policy and Economics
George Washington University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
"Independent Higher Education in the Post-War Era"	2
"Public Interest in Independent Higher Education"	4
"The Independent Colleges Respond to the Problem"	7
MEASURING STATE ASSOCIATION IMPACT	8
"Is a Group Effort a Cause of or a Response to State Aid?"	9
HOW DO STATE ASSOCIATIONS MAKE THEIR IMPACT?	11
"State Associations Write Legislation"	15
"Group Credibility - The Association as an Information Source"	16
"The Link Between Lobbying Techniques and Policy Output"	19
"Role of the Executive Director"	25
"Cohesion - the Key to Success"	27
"Economic, Political, and Educational Constraints"	30
A SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF GROUP IMPACT AND DISCUSSION OF FUTURE DIRECTIONS	34
"Guidelines for State Governments"	37
"The Road Ahead for State Associations"	38
REFERENCES	42
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	48

LIST OF TABLES

I. Average Tuition in Public and Independent Institutions of Higher Education, In Current and 1974 Dollars, Selected Academic Years, 1956-57 to 1975-76	4
II. Contributions of Independent Higher Education to Institutional Diversity, to Student Bodies, and Faculties of Higher Academic Ability, and to High Quality Graduate Programs	6
III. States That Do Not Have Interest Groups and Those in which an Interest Group was Organized After Aid Legislation was Passed	10
IV. Profile of Aid to Independent Colleges in Six Case Study States, 1978-79	13
V. Categorical Ratings of the Case Study States	33

INDEPENDENT COLLEGE INTEREST GROUP
INFLUENCE ON STATE POLICY

Introduction

State aid to independent colleges increased by 60 percent during the three-year period from 1976 to 1978. While the disparity between the \$750 million dollars states spent in 1978 in support of independent higher education and the billions of state dollars appropriated for public higher education is vast, the percentage increase in funds to independent colleges exceeded increases to state systems by 20 percent over the three-year period.¹ Between 1972 and 1978 the number of states having independent college associations lobbying state government for financial support nearly doubled.²

This report examines the recent remarkable increase in state aid to independent colleges and the doubling of interest groups representing independent colleges in the states, and finds a demonstrable relationship between the two facts. The positions argued here are that the chief factor motivating states to act on behalf of independent colleges is influence from interest groups representing independent colleges at the state level and that the strength of interest groups affects the amount of aid appropriated to independent colleges. Interest group strength is measured in terms of the amount of money the group spends, the degree of internal unity within the organization, the quality of leadership, the skillful use of strategy, and the variety of tactics used to influence policy.

Interest group influence can be demonstrated statistically by measuring the effect of interest group spending on state aid to independent colleges against the effect of socioeconomic, political and educational variables that influence education policy. Case studies of selected states offer a vehicle for evaluation of the relationship between policy output and interest group operations. A summary of the findings of a multivariate statistical study demonstrating interest group influence is presented here. The complete analysis and methodology are reported elsewhere. The body of this report, through case study analysis, examines how groups make an impact. Quality of leadership, group structure, strategy and tactics used to influence legislation, cohesion among association members, definition of policy goals and

confrontation of constraints affecting achievement of those goals are subjects discussed. Factors describing group operations interface differently in different states and the effect

the combination yield varies with the state. This descriptive information offers examples for action that can be applied to and adapted for settings other than those analyzed here.

Background

The dual system of higher education in the United States, which has drawn praise nationally and internationally from political and educational observers, faces serious threats to its preservation. Economic pressures and enrollment declines forecast for the 1980s endanger the stability of the independent sector and, consequently, the dual nature of the system. The forces leading independent colleges to coalesce illustrate the importance of analyses examining their response to current challenges. These forces have gradually eroded the economic stability and competitive appeal of private institutions in a market that mixes government-subsidized activity with nonprofit private enterprise.

"Independent Higher Education in the Post-War Era"

Prior to the early 1950s, more than one-half of the students enrolled in colleges and universities were attending independent schools. From 1950 to the present, the total number of students enrolled in independent colleges has increased, but the percentage of college students enrolled in these schools has steadily declined to a reported 22 percent in 1976.³ The growth of state universities and community colleges has significantly increased participation in post secondary education and accounts in part for the percentage shift in college student enroll-

ment from independent to public institutions.

This growth is viewed by state governments as fulfilling nationally defined and established policy goals such as providing access to and opportunity for higher education to every qualified citizen.⁴ The independent colleges consider the factors that have made this growth possible — namely low-cost tuition at state schools and tax subsidies that offset increasing operating costs — a threat to their livelihood and, consequently, a threat to other policy goals such as choice

and diversity.

The 100 independent institutions that closed and the 40 that merged between 1970 and 1978 lend a note of harsh reality to the fears expressed by some independent colleges.⁵ The "tuition gap" is at the heart of the problem. This gap represents the average difference between the tuition cost of an education at a private school versus that at a state school. The problem caused by the tuition gap is that the unique options offered by independent colleges lose their drawing power as the price difference increases.

The "tuition gap" represents a difference in price to the consumer, but not a difference in cost to the producer. The independent colleges have consistently functioned at a competitive disadvantage because of price differences and at an operational disadvantage because, while their costs have kept pace with those of public institutions, tax subsidies have not been available to them to meet those costs. As Table I indicates, the gap widened from a ratio of three to one in the mid-1950s to a five to one ratio in the mid-1970s. The gap widened appreciably between 1956-57 and 1964-65 as the effects of sputnik and the baby boom increased the demand for college opportunities. Slight fluctuations have occurred since the mid-sixties, but the gap has not narrowed noticeably at any time.⁶

During the early 1970s,

private higher education responded to the tuition gap threat on an individual basis by cutting budgets, increasing recruitment efforts, stepping up their development programs, attempting in some cases to increase enrollment by lowering selection criteria, abandoning single-sex status, placing more emphasis on the quality of programs and good teaching, and introducing or expanding popular career oriented programs. These efforts, along with increased state and federal aid, helped stabilize many institutions during the 1970s.⁷ However, new concerns emerged with prospects in the 1980s for continued overall inflation, rising energy costs, and a stagnant economy.

The belt tightening that brought stability in the mid-seventies stripped many institutions of the budget reserves and budget flexibility that are required to meet a financial crisis. Moreover, two-thirds of the four-year independent schools receive at least 70 percent of their unrestricted educational and general revenues from tuition and fees. These institutions rely on a growing or stable enrollment to balance the operating budget.⁸ While the 25 percent decline in the number of 18-year-olds between 1979 and 1992 need not be paralleled by declining college enrollments, it is hard to imagine a minimum decline of 25 percent being offset by increased participation by the student groups that are expected to increase, that is, minorities, women, and older students.⁹

TABLE I
AVERAGE TUITION IN PUBLIC AND INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER
EDUCATION, IN CURRENT AND 1974 DOLLARS
SELECTED ACADEMIC YEARS, 1956-57 to 1975-76¹⁰

Academic Year	Current Dollars			1974 Dollars			Ratio Independent to Public
	Public	Independent	Dollar Gap	Public	Independent	Dollar Gap	
1956-57	173	589	416	314	1,069	755	3.4:1
1961-62	218	906	688	359	1,493	1,134	4.2:1
1964-65	243	1,088	845	386	1,730	1,344	4.5:1
1966-67	275	1,233	958	418	1,874	1,456	4.5:1
1967-68	283	1,297	1,014	418	1,916	1,498	4.6:1
1968-69	295	1,383	1,088	418	1,962	1,544	4.7:1
1969-70	324	1,534	1,210	436	2,065	1,629	4.7:1
1971-72	176	1,820	1,444	458	2,217	1,759	4.8:1
1972-73	407	1,898	1,491	480	2,238	1,758	4.7:1
1974-75	470	2,131	1,661	470	2,131	1,661	4.5:1
1975-76	513	2,333	1,820	470	2,138	1,668	4.5:1

SOURCES: Current dollars, Martin M. Frankel and Forest W. Harrison, Projections of Education Statistics to 1985-86, National Center for Education Statistics (GPO, 1977), table 41, and relevant preceding issues of Projections; 1974 dollars, calculated from the current dollar data by application of the consumer price index from U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, converted to 1974 = 100.

"Public Interest in Independent Higher Education"

These circumstances in the 1970s raised a series of questions regarding the independent sector. What services does it provide? What are the unique contributions offered by independent higher education, if any? What steps, if any, should be taken by government to preserve the system? Three major policy studies appeared in

1977 and 1978 addressing these questions and affirming the importance of the independent schools.¹¹ The report of the Education Commission of the States suggests a policy perspective appropriate for state-level policymakers who are committed to preserving a public-independent system of higher education.

Public and independent higher education have developed apart from one another, the former under state auspices, support and planning, and the latter largely following the separate purposes of numerous individual institutions. Now that postsecondary education as a whole is no longer expanding as it once was the isolated development of these two systems is a thing of the past. Independent institutions are calling for state support while public institutions call for control over the continuous expansion of independent institutions. There is a great need for careful review and development of state policies on independent institutions in order to insure the best overall use of resources for postsecondary education for both public and independent institutions and in order to serve students and to respond to the other needs of the state.

Every state is different, and each must develop policies that make sense in light of its own planning, total educational environment, legal and fiscal constraints, independent sector role and status.¹²

Nationwide, the independent colleges are providing a public service and a benefit to taxpayers at an estimated annual net cost of five billion dollars.¹³ According to Table II taken from The State and Private Higher Education, a Carnegie study, independent colleges are largely responsible for providing students the opportunity to attend small, single-sex, and predominantly black institutions.¹⁴ Moreover, the "establishment clause" of the First Amendment requires students seeking an education at a church-related institution to choose an independent college. In addition to providing choice and diversity almost exclusively, Table II supports the Carnegie study assertion that the independent colleges and universities make a

significant qualitative contribution to higher education.

Despite the tuition gap, the independent colleges' share of low income students is proportionately just below that of state schools. Independent schools serve the access and opportunity objectives of American higher education as well as the objectives of choice and diversity. In addition to available federal and state student aid, low-income students require sizable subsidies to meet the cost of education at an independent college. In order to serve the low-income student, independent colleges provide these subsidies from institutional funds.¹⁵

Areneman and Finn view the growth and contributions of the

TABLE II

CONTRIBUTIONS OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION
TO INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY, TO STUDENT BODIES
AND FACULTIES OF HIGH ACADEMIC ABILITY.
AND TO HIGH-QUALITY GRADUATE PROGRAMS¹⁶

	Private As Percent of Total Institutions with Specified Characteristics
<u>Diversity</u>	
Institutions with enrollments under 500 students	82
Institutions for women only	98
Institutions for men only	94
Institutions founded predominantly for black students	66
<u>Student Bodies and Faculties of High Academic Ability</u>	
Institutions with combined freshman SAT scores over 1000	73
Institutional affiliation of members of National Academy of Sciences. 1975 (% of members not institutions)	63
<u>High Quality Graduate Programs</u>	
Top ranked graduate departments	58
Top ranked professional schools	57

SOURCES: For men's and women's colleges, black colleges, and small colleges, U. S. National Center for Education Statistics (1975. Tables 97 and 109 and HEGIS data); recent data on SAT scores provided by Alexander Astin; for membership, National Academy of Sciences (n.d.); ranking of graduate departments, Roosa and Andersen (1970); and ranking of professional schools, "The Carter Report" (1977).

independent system as one of the most "...impressive success stories in the history of domestic institutions."¹⁷ But regardless of its recognized contribution to higher education, the tuition gap remains, and the future is uncertain. The Education Commission of the States, the Carnegie Council, and the Breneman and Finn studies all cite the state level of govern-

ment as primarily responsible for addressing this problem and indeed all problems facing higher education. Historically, the states have exercised prior rights over education policymaking. Because of the demographic, economic, and occupational differences among the states, the most appropriate policies for higher education will still be developed at the state level.

"The Independent Colleges Respond to the Problem"

State aid to independent colleges in a state in the Midwest increased from four million dollars in 1967-68, the year when the state association of independent colleges was formed in that state, to 35 million dollars in 1979-80. Over 16 million dollars of this aid is direct institutional or non-need-based aid. Between the years 1959 and 1971, a mid-Atlantic state appropriated four million dollars in capital improvements for independent colleges. In the years since 1971, the year in which the state association was formed and began lobbying for aid, 15.3 million dollars has been appropriated for construction and renovation of facilities on independent college campuses.¹⁸ College presidents and legislators in these states attribute the size of the increases to the work of interest groups representing independent colleges. In recent years, through such groups, independent colleges have sought many kinds of government support as a means

of paring down the competitive financial edge the public institutions enjoy in the drive to maintain enrollment.

As early as 1964, a few state association executives -- that is, lobbyists representing independent colleges -- began meeting informally to exchange information and strategies for achieving desired goals in state legislatures. In 1968 they established the Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities as an adjunct body of the American Association of Colleges. The membership in 1969 included 19 states. At that time, many state associations functioned as service organizations for the independent colleges rather than as interest groups. In 1971 the federation was abandoned in favor of an organization having more central control and the name was changed to the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. By 1975 the NCICU state associa-

tion membership had increased to include 36 states.¹⁹

The national organization separated from the American Association of Colleges in 1976. The independent colleges wanted a stronger lobbying voice in Washington and in the states, one that would not confuse their policy aims with those of the AAC. The new organization operates on two levels. The National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities (NIICU) is a tax-exempt organization performing research for the independent colleges and is funded by grants and membership dues. The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) is not tax-exempt, functions as a national lobby, and is responsible for government relations.²⁰

The state associations are represented by their state executive on a powerful committee within the NAICU structure, and are assisted in their efforts on the home front by an arm of NAICU

known as the State National Information Network (SNIN).²¹

However, state associations draw their strength from the belief that the individual college will make its impact on public policy and derive desirable and direct policy benefits from efforts expended at the state, not the national, level. By 1979, the number of state associations had increased to 39. Each state association is independently organized, has its own board of directors, purpose statement, and operating structure. While styles, strategies, and budgets vary greatly among state associations, they share one common aim: to gain access to state government offices for the purpose of improving the security of independent colleges. Narrowing the tuition gap is a primary policy goal of each state association.

The question addressed in this study concerns the activity and effectiveness of these state associations, individually and comparatively, in developing state support for independent colleges.

Measuring State Association Impact

The simultaneous growth of state aid to independent colleges and of the number of state associations representing these institutions, coupled with the circumstances prompting independent colleges to organize, suggests the existence of a relationship between interest group effort and state aid. This relationship was analyzed in a statistical, cross-sectional analysis that compared the influence of socioeconomic, political, education and interest group factors on state policy decisions concerning appropriations to independent colleges and/or their students. The basic question addressed in this aggregate or policy development analysis was whether interest groups have an impact on policy

decisions and whether the degree of effort expended by interest groups influences the level of aid awarded.

The results of the cross-sectional analysis including all states show that interest groups are statistically more important than political, socioeconomic or education measures used to test the influences affecting the level of aid to independent colleges. These measures included the degree of party competition, median level of income, state spending for state schools, state spending for education generally and state association spending.

When only states having state associations are included in the same analysis, the statistical influence of median level of income and spending for education generally increase, but they do not overtake the influence of interest group spending.

The percentage of the college student population enrolled in independent colleges varies widely across the states. This statistic was added to the model

on the assumption that state funding policies would indicate a responsiveness to the size of the independent college enrollment. This assumption is reasonable since service to this population provided by the independent colleges relieves state responsibility in the case of students who are state residents and adds income to the state through tuition revenue which is fed into the state economy through salaries and other operating expenses. When the percent of the college population enrolled in independent colleges by state is included in the analysis as a policy-influencing factor, it has no effect on state spending for independent colleges. Regardless of other adjustments made to the policy development model used in this analysis, interest groups representing independent colleges remained strongly related to state policy decisions on spending that supports independent colleges.

"Is a Group Effort a Cause of or a Response to State Aid?"

Because the number of state associations increased during the same time period in which state aid increased, the argument can be made that group effort may be an effect rather than a cause of state aid to independent colleges. Independent colleges may have based the decision to commit funds to the interest group

effort on benefits already received as a result of state aid, rather than actually initiating the move to obtain aid. In order to examine the issue of flow of causation, the 39 state association executives were asked when their groups were organized, when they began to lobby, and when the first aid legislation was

passed.²² If the majority of state associations were established before state aid was passed the assumption would be that the group was a cause rather than an effect of state aid. Thirty-five responses showed interest group lobbying preceded aid legislation in 29 states.

Table III presents data for six states in which aid preceded group efforts. New York, one of

these states, has had aid for 60 years, which makes it a somewhat anomalous case within the sample. In Illinois, the first aid legislation began in 1959. The state association began in 1904, but the association did not engage in lobbying until 1960. However, since the significant aid legislation in Illinois was passed after 1960, it seems fair to say that group activity preceded aid.

TABLE III

STATES THAT DO NOT HAVE INTEREST GROUPS AND THOSE
IN WHICH AN INTEREST GROUP WAS ORGANIZED
AFTER AID LEGISLATION WAS PASSED

(Mean for FTE Aid--50 States--\$265)

Non-Interest Group States		State Aid Preceded Interest Group Organization			
State	Aid per FTE 1978-79	State	Aid per FTE 1978-79	Year Aid Given	Year Group Organized
Alaska	\$ 27	Illinois	\$ 689	1959	1960
Arizona	71	Indiana	267	1967	1972
Colorado	10	Kansas	320	1963	1970
Hawaii	22	Massachusetts	95	1965	1967
Idaho	5	New York	711	1913	1973
Nevada	58	Oregon	268	1961	1969
New Hampshire	30				
Rhode Island	151				
Utah	13				
Vermont	161				
Wyoming*	0				

*Wyoming has no independent colleges.

SOURCES: Aid per FTE student: State Aid to Independent Colleges and Universities per FTE Student, 1978-79, the New York Council of Independent Colleges and universities, published in January, 1979. Dates were acquired from state associations polled in August, 1979.

The states that do not have interest groups are also listed in Table III. It is clear from this list that with the exception of Nevada all of these states are awarding aid that is well below the \$265 mean and that is negligible in six states. In most cases this aid is need-based and not available exclusively to independent college students.

The majority of the states had an interest group prior to the passage of legislation providing state aid to independent

colleges or their students. States that do not have interest groups provide minimal assistance to the independent colleges. By 1976, 35 of the 39 interest groups were lobbying. Between 1976 and 1978, aid increased by 60 percent nationwide. This sizable increase in aid occurred while most groups were lobbying, not prior to their establishment. This information supports the view that the flow of causation is primarily from group effort to aid rather than the reverse.

How Do State Associations Make Their Impact?

Establishing a statistical relationship between the level of group spending and the level of aid states appropriate to independent colleges suggests that these groups deserve considerable attention in studies of state policies affecting independent colleges. However, aggregate analysis that looks only at group spending leaves many questions about group effectiveness unanswered.

The primary question is whether or not a relationship exists between the level of aid and the strategy, tactics, and internal workings of state associations. Related questions include: How do groups establish policy goals? How do they translate goals into implemented legislation? How important to goal achievement are concepts of group success identified in prior research on interest group activity, such as access, qualification of leadership, and cohesion? How do associations contend with political and economic constraints? Is there a definable combination of group characteris-

tics that describes successful achievement?

State association executives from 16 states were interviewed informally to arrive at a method for answering these questions analytically.²³ Neither these conversations nor examination of legislation and published documents from state associations revealed definite operational patterns characterizing states as high or low achievers in the contest for state dollars.

For this reason, six states, that include characteristics describing state association activi-

ty and state aid programs nationwide, were chosen for case study analysis. Other reasons for selecting these states include: The aid levels vary among the six states by a ratio of three to one; all types of aid are represented; the variety of strategies used to obtain aid is extensive; the political and economic characteristics of the states vary to a moderate degree; and circumstances in some of these states forecast the nature of future interest group-state government interaction.

Table IV summarizes the aid programs in the six states. Four of the six states have direct institutional aid programs. Three states have non-need-based tuition assistance plans available to state residents who attend independent colleges in the state. Independent colleges consider this the most attractive of the student aid programs serving independent colleges. State B has a small number of independent colleges, ranks fourth for aid per FTE student nationwide, and supports every major type of aid program. State E has a large number of independent colleges, ranks third for aid per FTE student nationwide, and offers only need-based student aid.

All of the states selected for study have enjoyed considerable success in achieving policy goals. All award aid is close to or above the mean for aid per FTE student. States awarding aid far below the mean were not included because approximately one-third

of them do not have interest groups and, with few exceptions, the others are not as active in their lobbying approach as these six.

While there are noticeable similarities in the group operations of the case study states, significant differences exist as well. In State B, only the paid staff lobby directly. In State E, the college presidents lobby, the state association executive does not. In State C, most lobbying is done outside the halls of the legislature. In the other five states this is not the case. Four associations include a research and information gathering component. The other two associations do not. These are a few of the variations in group operations that were considered in choosing this combination of case study states. These and other group characteristics are examined to assess their relationship to policy output.

Data describing state wealth, educational spending, minority strength, and political party strength were also considered in choosing the six states. Though interest group and state aid characteristics received prior consideration in selection of the case study states, an attempt was made to choose a set of states that are not heavily weighted at the top or the bottom of the scale in any of the political or socioeconomic areas so that these factors do not overshadow information explaining the relationship between group effort and state aid.

Table IV
PROFILE OF AID TO INDEPENDENT COLLEGES IN SIX CASE STUDY STATES, 1976-79

State***	Direct Institutional Aid	Student Aid			Total Dollars Millions
		Non Need Based Aid	Need Based Aid Independent colleges only	Need Based State & Independent College Students. Amount Awarded to Independent Schools	
State A	Stipend per FTE student enrolled in independent colleges. Capital funding			Need Based Scholarships	11.0
State B	Degree reimbursement for degrees awarded in Health programs*	Tuition Assistance for all Full-time Independent College Students*	Need Based Grants*	Need Based Scholarships	29.20
State C	Grants for Medical Schools*	Tuition Assistance*	Need Based Grants*	State Student Incentive Grant	17.5
State D	Medical & Dental School Grants			Need Based Grants	10.9
State E	Direct Aid to "State Aided" institutions. Direct assistance to independent colleges for each scholarship recipient. Aid for Foundational Programs and Vocational Education**			Grants	95.3
State F		Tuition Assistance*		Scholarship	6.7

Source: State-National Information Network, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

* Bills prepared for legislation by state associations

**Not used to calculate FTE

***Grants are listed in alphabetical order

According to the amount of state aid per FTE student, the six state associations studied rank in the upper one-half of states having interest groups representing independent colleges. Yet variation in aid levels from the highest to the lowest state in the group of six is almost \$400 per student. The information employed to examine to what extent the state associations are responsible for the aid level in their states and what efforts they expended to reach

that level suggests that aid level is clearly related to state association operations. There is no evidence to suggest that an association that employs a carefully designed strategy and good leadership, and that expends an extensive united effort will fail to achieve sizable policy goals.

The case study analysis is organized into six areas of inquiry: (1) the origin of aid legislation to independent colleges; (2) group credibility and

value as an information source; (3) access routes used to influence policy; (4) the role of the executive director; (5) the degree of internal cohesion and its effect on group action; and (6) political, environmental, and educational constraints affecting aid to independent colleges. It is reasonable to assume that the extent to which legislative proposals originate with and are written by the state association is indicative of the degree of impact groups have on policy-making. Group credibility, access routes, executive leadership, and cohesion are aspects of group activity cited by analysts of group activity as necessary to group effectiveness.²⁴ These concepts are evaluated to determine their impact individually on policy output in the case study states and to assess the combined effect of these factors on achievement of policy goals.

Information was gathered from the state files in the SNIN-NIICU library in Raleigh, North Carolina, and from interviews. Interviews were conducted with the state association executive director in each of the six states and with 20 state legislators and college presidents in the states who are knowledgeable about aid to independent colleges in their states and about their state associations. The state legislators interviewed are or were key members of education or appropriations committees, and the college presidents are or have served as chairmen or as members of the executive committees of their state associations.

Interviews were conducted from October, 1979, through January, 1980.

The interview questions were designed to yield as much information as possible about the internal operations of the groups, the interaction between association staff, association members and policymakers and the perceptions of those interviewed regarding the importance of the state associations.²⁵ While the interview format was unstructured and interviews varied in length and content, each interview included the same topic areas. These are described in Appendix A. The outcome of the study suggests that in states where the aid per FTE student is highest the state associations lobby more intensely and constantly, use a wider range of access routes to reach policymakers, and maintain a higher degree of internal cohesion than do the state associations in states where the aid level is lower. The influence of the six state associations over the kinds of aid legislation that exists in their states appears to be direct and powerful. All of the state associations receive high ratings from legislators for credibility and integrity. Though the quality and quantity of information produced by each association vary noticeably from one state to another, all state associations are recognized by their membership and by legislators as legitimate and accurate information sources. Political and environmental constraints are more apparent in State B, a state in the Midwest and State F, a Southern state,

than in other states. In these two states the association strategy has been designed to accomo-

date these constraints and the results have been effective.

"State Associations Write Legislation"

The legislation providing aid exclusively to independent colleges in the six states was drafted by state association executive directors and/or members. In state E, preparation of major legislation has been a joint effort on the part of legislators and state association members. In the remaining states the sponsoring legislators subsequently restyled language to conform to state legislative requirements. A description of state aid programs is provided in Table IV with the programs initiated by state association action marked with an asterisk. The description indicates that by 1978 the state associations in all states but State D had received multimillion dollar commitments in response to their proposals. And in State D the major piece of student aid legislation was presented originally as a bill written by the independent college association for needy independent college students only, but had to be amended and revised to include all needy state residents to accommodate to pressure from the state schools.

Though many of the aid bills were subject to revision and amendment after being introduced, one significant fact remains: 68.2 million dollars was being

appropriated annually by 1978 to independent colleges in five states through the initiative of state associations.²⁶ Legislators in all states attest to the credibility of the state association arguments in support of the aid bills and those interviewed in States B, C, D and F agreed that without state association influence, aid to independent colleges in these states would not exist or would represent a much smaller dollar commitment.

The implication here is not that the state associations have the power to transform needs into law magically. State associations trim their requests to levels they interpret to be legislatively feasible. Nevertheless, association involvement in drafting legislation illustrates the existence of a compatible relationship between key legislators and state association representatives that leads to successful achievement of policy goals. The legislator-lobbyist relationship that allows state associations to design their own legislation appears linked to an allegation by Robert Presthus, an analyst of interest group operations, that political activism is secondary in importance to group leadership and prestige.²⁷ If writing legislation is considered political activism, the

question is whether the nature of the political demand accounts for the support state associations receive or whether the prestige of the group influences legislators to support association legislative designs. The evidence does not offer a clear

answer. If the latter is true, Prethus' conclusion is supported. If the group prestige is secondary to the strength of the argument for aid to independent colleges as conveyed by the association, Prethus' view may be held in question.

"Group Credibility- The Association as an Information Source"

The six state association executives believe their degree of credibility with the legislature is high and that without credibility no appeal for aid will be effective. Legislators interviewed concur with this thinking and attribute state association credibility to three factors. First, the state associations do not escalate their demands and leave the legislature to guess at their actual needs. The interest groups ask for what they need and frame their needs within limits that the legislature can meet. Second, the state associations use data that are reliable and accurate to support their arguments. Third, over time the total annual appropriation figures requested in the various states have met, but not exceeded, the demand of aid users. These views and earlier comments regarding legislative preparation coincide with the interaction theory of political analysts Zeigler and Baer who argue that the lobbyist and the legislator are seeking to gain a common perception of a shared environment and that they do this

by eliciting information from each other.²⁸

Estimation of a state's credibility and information resource ratings was based on responses of college presidents and legislators to a request that they evaluate the state association in this area of performance. While one group may in fact be more credible than another, responses across the six states were uniform. No variation in reputation as a consequence of credibility was discernible. However, while information presented by associations is seen as credible, associations do vary in their performance as information providers and the performance level does influence effectiveness if not credibility. Quantity and quality of information vary, as well as the emphasis association members and legislators place on information as a tool for achieving policy goals.

State A, B, and C are the most researched-oriented states. Each of these states has a staff member whose primary tasks are to

analyze demographic information affecting independent colleges, prepare needs analyses of the independent colleges, and define the student population served by the independent colleges. The state executive in State C describes "numbers" as the most persuasive argument for aid, and legislators in State B cite the precise and constant use of figures by the state executive as a contributing factor to the effectiveness of that group. The increasing number of well educated, inquisitive legislators who take their stewardship of state resources seriously, coupled with the need to provide legitimate reasons based on fact for maintaining aid to independent colleges in the face of the pending enrollment decline, are two reasons why the State A association employs a researcher.

In State E, where a unique lobbying structure requires institutions to pay dues to two organizations, the membership will not support the additional dues that would be required to cover the cost of increasing the research capabilities of the organization. The State E association contracts with researchers at member universities for special projects. The State F association, which is unique nationwide for its low dues structure and the smallest annual operating budget, uses a similar research approach in the belief that ongoing research is not necessary to satisfy information needs. The State D association publishes a fact file which is updated each year, but which is not analytical

and has limited value as a tool for winning legislative support.

The compensatory approach to research and information gathering used in States E and F appears efficient and economical. Experienced academics are retained for research projects and the results are usually thorough and accurate. However, researchers retained for special project work are not likely to be motivated by the same commitment to independent colleges as an association staff member. A staff member whose efforts are continuous rather than intermittent is also likely to have more clearly targeted insights into membership needs and information, and analysis needed to demonstrate those needs.

While, to date, state associations have been generally rated as good information providers, there are new challenges ahead in at least two states. In State A the state association was asked in 1979 to prepare a lengthy 15-question brief for the Joint Committee on Higher Education Program Evaluation. The nature of the questions suggests that the legislature views the association (1) as an agent of accountability for the independent colleges in areas that go beyond demonstration of financial need and (2) as a resource for information that independent colleges in some states would not share with each other.

Two questions illustrate the point.

1. What was the amount of the annual operating capital budget for the independent colleges and universities during fiscal years 1970 through 1980? How much did each institution receive during this period and what was the amount of their total budget?
2. What are the distinguishing characteristics of each segment and institution of higher education? How does each institution differ with reference to admissions standards, athletic standards, academic standards, graduate activities, research activities and national or international reputation?

These questions call for qualitative, subjective responses and place the association in the awkward position of trying to satisfy the policymakers whose support it needs by assuming a role beyond its defined role as spokesman for its members' legislative needs. The state association responded to the request cautiously, but in detail. The association assumed the friendship of the evaluation committee, yet did not know the intended use of the report. This situation highlights a fear of many independent colleges. The trade-off for aid is accountability which can easily extend to encroachment by state boards on independent colleges. State associations are growing more vigilant in their attempt to protect their membership from this eventuality.

The last section of this chapter cites examples of encroachment in States D and F. In these states, fears of state control have led association members to include self-protection issues along with aid proposals in recent goals statements of their organizations.

In State D, the non-analytical fact file published annually by the state association does not provide the sophisticated information the legislature wanted as background supporting the non-need-based tuition assistance bill introduced in the State Senate in November, 1979. The bill, written by the association, asked for a grant to each state resident attending an independent college in an amount equaling one-half of the per-student subsidy the state provides its own institutions. Legislators wanted to know what the rate of return on their investment would be if they supported this bill. The State association does not have the capability to perform the kind of economic impact study required to provide this information.** The information resources were inadequate to the information need created by the legislative proposal. A college president who was active in the association lobbying for the legislation believed this to be one of the factors that caused the bill to die in committee.

In summary, while a specific link between information and

policy output cannot be demonstrated, it should be noted that States A, B, and C, which are the more research-oriented case study states, are also higher aid receivers than States D and F. It also appears likely that, as the state requirement that independent colleges demonstrate ac-

countability grows with respect to maintaining academic standards, serving a state population sizable enough to warrant support, and contributing to the state's economic growth, the research and information function of associations will expand and take on new importance.

"The Link Between Lobbying Techniques and Policy Output"

The level of aid per FTE student varies greatly among the six case study states (See Table IV). In 1978-79, States E, B, and A ranked third, fourth and fifth respectively for spending per FTE student enrolled in independent colleges. State C ranked 14th and States F and D, which fall below the mean for FTE student aid, ranked 19th and 20th respectively. The essential question is whether or not there is a link between the level of spending and the techniques and strategy used to obtain aid. The answer seems to be high aid goals coupled with multi-access route strategy, intense effort, and good organization yield good legislative results.

The techniques for gaining access to the legislature of this group of state associations include (1) direct lobbying in the halls and offices of the legislature and the executive branch; (2) phone calls to policymakers; (3) distribution of research reports; (4) verbal testimony before legislative committees; (5) letter writing campaigns; (6) en-

tertaining and honoring legislators; and (7) using the influence of powerful vote getters and prominent state residents to gain legislative support.

Interest group literature cites these techniques as typical. David Truman's discussion of techniques in The Political Process, which is the most extensive analysis, ranks personal contact such as phone calls and direct lobbying in legislative and executive offices as most effective. Letter writing campaigns and testimony before legislative committees may be useful and in the latter case essential, but these efforts are reputed to be less persuasive than direct contact. State association executives in all six states would generally agree with Truman's assessment. Nevertheless, each of the techniques listed is employed by at least one of the six states and use of the personal direct approach varies with the state.³⁰

State-by-state analysis of the six states according to the

relationship between the amount of aid appropriated by the state and the use of these techniques by state associations can be summarized as follows. State B, the fourth-ranking state nationwide, spending only two dollars less than State E for aid per FTE student, employs more of the techniques listed, more consistently and continuously than any other state. The State B effort demonstrates the link between aid levels and effective use of strategy and tactics. State A and C vary noticeably in terms of the amount of aid they offer, but the amount and type of direct lobbying in the two states are similar. If capital improvements money is removed from the dollar total for aid to independents in State A, the level of student aid in the two states is about equal.

State D has not asked for the heavy dollar commitments requested and received in the first four states and in the early 1970s State D lost its major bid to establish an aid program for independent institutions only. Despite its relatively sizable budget, its lobbying effort is considerably more low-key and less organized than efforts in the other states. The State F association has promoted two programs funded at moderate levels. Its goals have not been ambitious. Its lobbying effort is very conservative and its budget is one-eighth the national average. While it has been effective in achieving most established goals, the association does not invest the energy or time in seeking aid appropriations at levels compara-

ble to the four highest ranking states in this group of six. The State E association is a member of the cooperative lobby which includes all of higher education in the state under one umbrella organization. The cooperative strategy which is described later in this chapter accounts in part for the fact that State E is the highest-ranking case-study state for aid per FTE student.

The State B association has been cited by several state association executives as a model of effective use of strategy. Because the executive director of the state association is sole designer of the strategy, it can be described as a single-actor model. The executive director uses a game plan, believes lobbying directly is his job alone, and lobbies constantly when the legislature is in session. He describes the work as "...nasty and difficult, but necessary." His strategy is to work carefully for the exact number of required votes rather than general legislative approval. Use of accurate, meaningful data is essential. College presidents are selected and briefed by the executive director to present formal testimony when necessary but, unlike the pattern followed in most other states, presidents do no other direct lobbying. The college presidents in State B use indirect lobbying to win support from state legislators. Invitations to dinner and campus events and conferral of awards and honorary degrees are examples of the tactics used to win the legislators' support. The strategy is to allow the legislator to experience

the educational contribution made by the independent colleges and to recognize the legislator's service to the state, but not to link the recognition to support for specific aid legislation.

A directory published regularly by the State B state association and sent to state legislators lists the names and affiliations of trustees of the independent colleges. According to the state association executive, the directory "reads like a Who's Who in the state" and documents the commitment to the independent colleges of prominent, successful citizens. Trustees also contact legislators by phone or for lunch to reinforce the needs of the state association. These efforts are not lost on legislators who depend on many of these same people for campaign support at election time.

The combination of these efforts and the skillful execution of the various strategies makes the State B association unique among all state associations. The fact that the state ranks fourth nationwide for aid per FTE student with aid programs of every kind supports the argument that multiple access routes to policymakers yield good results.

Three conditions may be necessary to replicate this model: a director who has the capability and the authority to design and execute strategy successfully; a membership that includes an adequate number of enthusiastic, active supporters of that strategy; and a small

number of independent colleges. Mancur Olson, in his notable analysis of collective action, argues that small groups are more manageable and cohesive than large groups and suggests that the size factor should be considered.³¹ No evidence was found, however, in this study to suggest that group size affected the achievements of State B.

With the exception of State E, executive directors in case-study states engage in direct lobbying, but not to the same degree as the association executive in State B. In State C, the contact with legislators is more often maintained by telephone than in the halls of the legislature. College presidents lobby directly in States A, D, E, and F where comments by college presidents and state association executives suggest the control of the executive director over strategy is more flaccid than in State B. College presidents may testify in the legislatures in all case-study states except State A where that responsibility is left to the executive director. Few state association members engage in as much indirect lobbying as in State B. When they do, it is at their own initiative rather than as part of a concerted state association effort to maintain rapport with legislators.

The association in State E gains access to the legislature through direct and indirect lobbying by college presidents. The executive director is not permitted to lobby. His attention is focused on educating presidents to

the benefits of state aid and persuading them to include lobbying for state aid as a significant part of their development effort. This state was included in the study because the success of the state association is related to the unique cooperative structure that unites the lobbying efforts of four higher education constituencies under one umbrella organization. This strategy of cooperation has been effective for the independent colleges in State E but it has not been imitated by higher education groups in other states. However, college presidents and executive directors in some states view it as a timely strategy for meeting the challenge of declining enrollments and duplication of resources by transforming competition among public and independent schools in cooperation.

In order to belong to the independent college commission in State E, an institution must belong to the umbrella organization. Independent, state-aided, state-owned, and community colleges make their needs known to the legislature and governor through this organization rather than separately. The effect of this cooperative structure is that trade-offs and accommodations are made among the four constituencies before funds are officially requested. Consequently, constituencies are not publicly warring with each other for dollars, and the appeal to the legislature of each constituency has the support of the other three.

According to a university president who served as chairman of the independent college commission, this structure allowed the independent colleges to enjoy the benefits of the existing grant legislation, which is the backbone of aid to independent institutions, two years earlier than anticipated. A surplus in the treasury in 1974 made the timing right, but the key to passage was a trade-off with the state schools that were battling a threat by the state to increase their tuition. The independent state association won support from the state schools for the grant legislation in return for their agreement to oppose or at least not support legislation increasing tuition at state schools. The independent colleges, assisted by supporting legislators, also developed a skillful one-to-one lobbying strategy that assured support from the governor and key committee chairmen before the grant bill came up for discussion.

The cooperative arrangement that prevails in State E was initiated by four college presidents from the four constituencies who served simultaneously as chairmen of their respective groups. Their view that the cooperative aspects of the structure outweigh its liabilities is shared by state association members in States A, B, and C where battles with the public institutions for state support are continuous and expensive.

The cooperative model echoes an analysis of congressional lobbying by Abraham Holtzman. Holtz-

men contends that coalition lobbying increases the breadth of issue appeal in the legislature, provides division of labor for lobbyists at the grass roots level, and adds credibility to research by individual groups.³² National higher education lobbies have found that coalitions receive a more favorable response from the legislature than separate appeals. At the state level, the coalition model is found only in State E. However, the public-independent consortia that exist in many local communities provide a forum for exploring a shared effort. Also, in the face of the threat of retrenchment as the 18-year-old population declines, one might expect that legislators will exhort the public and private institutions to adopt a cooperative appeal for funds that forces individual groups to shape their demands to satisfy the totality of state higher education needs. College presidents and the state association executive in State B have taken steps in preparation for this time by encouraging cooperation at the local community level and by appointing prestigious personnel in the academic ranks of the public institutions to boards of trustees of the independent colleges.

None of the case study state associations enlists the support of trustees to the same extent or in the same way as the association in State B. In State C, trustees may give active support but only at the request of the college president. In State D,

according to one college president, trustees serve overlapping and competing constituencies and prefer to work behind the scenes when their help is requested rather than have their names linked publicly to aid for independent colleges. While this kind of individual support is useful, it lacks the impact of the "Who's Who" approach used in State B. In states A, E, and F, there is little evidence of involvement by trustees in the lobbying effort. All six state associations capitalize on the support of legislators who are graduates of association member schools, particularly graduates of prestigious universities and professional schools. These products of independent education add to the legitimacy of group demands.

Truman cites the limitations and liabilities of letter-writing campaigns. The technique has been used successfully, however, by the state associations in two case-study states.³³ In 1977, funds appropriated for the need-based grant in State D proved insufficient to meet the need. When the legislature decided to resolve the problem by lowering the income level for eligibility rather than appropriating more money, the decision particularly hurt the independent colleges where the higher proportion of needy students are in the upper income brackets. The state association members flooded the legislature with letters from students, trustees, and college presidents. The original income levels for eligibility were restored and the necessary money was appropriated.

According to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Higher Education, the State D association earned a reputation among legislators for effective action as a result of this campaign.

In State F, college presidents and their trustees used letters and telegrams to keep the needs of the independent colleges before the legislature during the legislative sessions that considered the tuition assistance plan and the constitutional amendment necessary to its implementation. This effort was less dramatic than the campaign in State D, but successful, nonetheless. State association executives and college presidents in the other states do not advocate letter writing because they fear the use of form letters sent to legislators in multiple copies. This strategy often precipitates a negative rather than positive reaction. In states D and F, the letters were apparently originals, legislators apparently read their mail, and in these cases the campaigns were productive.

The set of circumstances that faced each state association as it developed its lobbying strategy was different. The tactics and techniques used to shape those strategies are recognized as standard in the literature. As Holtzman and Truman both argue, it is the persistent lobbyist whose contact is direct who makes an impact.³³ The experience in State B, and to

lesser extent in States A and C, favor direct contact that is not only persistent but consistently targeted to secure the necessary votes through good, well presented arguments. Another facet of direct lobbying that is attractive to legislators is communication that shows genuine personal concern. Active trustee support and letter writing are two less direct tactics given limited but effective use. Though trustees' support receives little notice in the literature and letter writing is discouraged, this report cites the value of both tactics.

This summary of activities in six states demonstrates that techniques of gaining legislative support cannot be ranked from most to least successful. However, employing a broad range of techniques in an organized, constant effort appears to yield more aid than efforts that are less organized, diverse, and energetic, and the cooperative constituency model shows that legislators respond positively to a unified educational effort.

Two factors that have a powerful influence over the intensity of effort and level of organization a group can achieve are the role of the state association director and the level of cohesion that exists within the group. Strategy, leadership, and cohesion are interlocking factors. Each of them yields only a piece of the evidence that describes the quality of a state association operation.

"Role of the Executive Director"

Five factors determine the influence a state association executive director has over policy output in the state: (1) the persuasive skills and grasp of relevant detail he or she possesses; (2) the rapport the director maintains with the legislature; (3) the leadership role he or she assumes toward the membership; (4) the degree of autonomy extended to the director by the membership; (5) the energy and enthusiasm the director invests in the job.

The executive directors from States A, C, D, and E have advanced degrees. Two have served as college presidents and one worked as a legislative assistant for a state legislator and in a governor's budget office. The director in State B was a teacher and worked for another education lobby in the state before coming to the independent college association. The executive director in State F is a retired industrialist who owned a sizable company and came to his job with well established contacts in the state legislature.

According to Robert Presthus' elaborate study of interest group activity, the experience of the director is a strong contributor to group effectiveness.³⁴ The experience of the state association staff leaders in these states is primarily in higher education, not in politics or lobbying. In State C the director of the asso-

ciation believed experience in higher education and knowledge of the needs and value of independent colleges to be more useful than political or lobbying experience. The background of directors nationwide suggests that this opinion is widely held by college presidents who make up the association membership.

In light of the Presthus study it is interesting to speculate on the fact that the only state association director with prior experience in lobbying runs the fourth ranking state association nationwide, State B, and employs the most broadbased strategy of the six case-study states. Legislators in all six states expressed confidence in the integrity and sincerity of the state association executive in their states. However, once again the state association in this fourth ranking state stands out. A senior politician describes the director as "compassionate, trustworthy, and a master of data," and a man whose integrity and reputation are known throughout the legislature.

Not surprisingly, the most enthusiastic comments about state association directors from college presidents come from presidents in State B. One president believes this association is effective because (1) the legislature understands the appropriateness of aid to independent colleges; (2) the independent colleges speak with one voice; and (3) "(our director)

is just plain good." When a debate arose among the association members in State B over whether the recently passed tuition assistance legislation should request a flat grant for each enrolled student or a grant tied to a percentage formula based on the subsidy per FTE student that the state pays to state institutions the college presidents acceded to the director's insistence that in the state's depressed economy only a flat grant proposal would be acceptable.

Conflict resolution and recommending policy positions are essential aspects of the leadership role played by the director. Analysis of comments made by college presidents in the six states indicated that only in states B and C can the director be relatively certain that arguments like the one described above will be settled in accord with his recommendation. While college presidents generally express confidence in their directors and look to them for policy recommendations, presidents set limits on the autonomy of the director and emphasize that he or she serves at the will of the membership.

Only one state seems to have a leadership problem. This state is also the lowest ranking case-study state in terms of aid to independent colleges. While the two leading staff members are well liked and work consistently, some college presidents in the state express the view that executive leadership is lacking. Other presidents are reluctant to extend more power or demand more

leadership from the directors though it is not clear whether this is due to their perception of the leadership or their lack of interest in the state association as a whole. There is a view among presidents that pending legislation will be adversely affected by the leadership problem.

Successful state association executives are enthusiastic in their support of the independent college cause. Their enthusiasm is born out of a belief that the institutions they represent play a vital role in American higher education and in American society. This faith commitment coincides with an interpretation of their role as executive directors as being the role of an initiator of policy plans and strategy. This view may be held despite perceptions by some state association members of the executive director essentially as a reactor and communicator of membership views. When successful leadership is measured in terms of aid-levels achieved, the successful executive director also displays qualities of knowledgeability and persuasiveness. Accurate knowledge about the immediate and long-range needs of the independent college constituency, the fiscal condition of the state, and existing political constraints is crucial to good policy development. State executives who possess, and are perceived as possessing, this kind of knowledge are found in states that rank highest for state aid per FTE student. Realistic policy goals are established and reached when the executive director has the persuasive ability to achieve a

consensus among the membership in support of such goals and then to employ a strategy that wins adequate support in the executive and legislative branches of the state government. While the membership must extend sufficient autonomy to the executive director to permit this kind of strong leadership, the executive director must present himself as seeking and capable of this degree of trust and authority by presenting

the qualities just described.

The implication is clear. The role played by the state association director influences state policy. It would seem that to ensure effective leadership, the state association must choose a person as director who has the confidence of the membership, must clearly define his or her role, and allow him or her sufficient autonomy.

"Cohesion — The Key to Success"

The problem of cohesion is a crucial one for the political interest... the degree of unity in the group is probably most fundamental in determining the measure of success it will enjoy.³⁵

David Truman follows this statement with the observation that since an appearance of unity is essential to "...a political formula for group effectiveness, most groups are careful to reveal as little as possible to the outsider concerning such internecine struggles."³⁶ Interviews with college presidents and state association directors revealed problems facing associations as they try to maintain cohesion among their members. However, at this time each of the six associations is successfully presenting the "appearance of unity" that Truman describes as essential to legislative success.

Looking at the degree of cooperation as a measure of cohe-

siveness, the most cohesive groups appear to be the State B, C, and E associations. Not only do the State B and C associations agree on specific legislative goals, they also use the collective resources of their membership to spread the word throughout their states that independent colleges offer choice and diversity at affordable prices. These associations annually issue booklets to high school seniors that include a prospectus of each of their member schools. It is inexpensive advertising and an enrollment-producing device that explains state aid to all prospective college students in the state. In State E, cooperative workshops have been established to provide independent colleges management training and systems analyses.

The conflicts that affect the level of cohesion within state associations fall into three categories: (1) members have differing opinions about the kind of aid that will be most beneficial; (2) the small schools believe their needs are overshadowed by the prestigious universities; (3) the core of institutions that work energetically for the association resent the indifference of institutions that share in aid benefits, but not in the effort to acquire them.

Internal conflicts over the type of aid program that best serves the independent colleges are usually resolved through information sessions and behind the scenes politicking that ultimately bring consensus. The State D association has faced the most serious and prolonged conflict over choice of an aid program. The smaller, less secure schools believe direct institutional aid will benefit them most directly. The "second level" institutions, that are moderate in size, well established, and nationally recognized, believe that direct aid will not receive the support of a conservative legislature and that such aid probably violates the state constitution. They believe student aid is more acceptable to the legislature. This disagreement was resolved in favor of "second level" schools. After two years of delay, a bill calling for a tuition assistance grant for every student attending an independent college was introduced in the state senate. Because membership support for the bill is still lukewarm, there are

presidents who believe legislative approval will not come easily.

In State B, from time to time, the membership has questioned the discrepancy between the large amount of state aid received by the largest independent university proportionate to that received by the other independent institutions. The executive director has attacked the problem by making clear to the membership that while this university receives more aid than the other independent colleges, because of professional and health degree reimbursement programs, the prominence and reputation of the university legitimizes the independent college cause, thereby making the institution an asset to all of the members. Frank discussion usually evolves into consensus in this state. In State A, the major independent university tends to overwhelm other members because of its size and prestige, but the membership realizes that active support by this well-endowed institution reinforces the legitimacy of their demands for aid. The ranking university in State C does not interject itself into association activities so there is no direct disagreement. But association members fear that a state legislator who chooses to consider the budget and salary figures at this seemingly wealthy institution as representative of independent college finances will be unsympathetic in his response to the pleas of independent colleges for aid. The university president is cognizant of this problem and remains in the background.

All state associations suffer from the apathy and disinterest that some of their members evidence. All schools eligible for aid in the six states are members of their respective associations with the exception of a few very poor institutions that cannot afford dues and one school in State B that disagrees with the aid philosophy of the association. Nevertheless, many institutions do little more than pay their dues. When a very active college president from a sizable institution in State E was asked whether the lack of participation occurred more frequently among smaller schools where the college president is overworked and does not have the staff to afford him or her the time to be active, he responded forcefully that two of the more effective association members in that state were presidents of small women's colleges having no staff assistance. "A person finds time for the things that are important to him or her," was his summary statement on the issue. His view was echoed by college presidents in all six states.

One college president in State D was appalled when some college presidents did not even attend regional association meetings scheduled with legislators to discuss a pending non-need-based bill serving independent colleges. Other presidents came to these meetings unprepared. He believes his association is proof of the accuracy of Mancur Olson's theory that unless benefits are direct and swift, voluntary associations will lack consensus

and be ineffective.³⁷

The association in State F appears to have the least amount of dissension within the ranks. Perhaps this is because the policy goals of the association are narrowly defined and require cooperation among the members in only three basic areas. Because the members do not seek to go beyond these boundaries there is little cause for conflict. The areas of cooperation are promotion of increases to the grant level of the tuition assistance program extending money to the independent colleges through non-need-based student grants, guarding against encroachment by the state in independent college operations, and limiting competition from out-of-state university extension programs. Since there is no aid legislation targeting money to special programs at individual institutions and since the largest university is not as pretigious as those in other case-study states, conflict between the haves and have-nots is not a problem.

The example set by State F suggests that establishing a unity of purpose and level of consensus proportionate to a limited set of policy goals yields the desired legislative response. Viewing the degree of cooperation among members as a indicator of cohesion, it appears that state association memberships that cooperate on a variety of levels acquire more aid than those who do not. Finally, regardless of the degree of unity existing in an organization, active state association members regard internal cohesion and unity

of purpose as essential ingredients to legislative success.

Truman speaks of an "active minority" of informed, experienced, motivated group members that lend an oligarchic character to the structure of most groups. In his judgment, this minority strengthens the group, gives it direction, and should make its policy decisions. Truman cites groups that have memberships numbering in the hundreds or thousands.³⁸ In large groups, the notion of the power centers he describes is easily understood. The state associations representing independent colleges vary in size from 11 schools in Louisiana and West Virginia to New York which has 208 and California, the second largest association, with 122 schools. Despite their size and the fact that the average group age is ten years, the "active minority" concept seems to have taken hold. With the exception of State F, the case-study state associations seem to be impelled to action by an "active minority" that decries

rather than husbands its power. One college president described the executive committee in his association as a group that had taken on its own image and become a group within a group. While most active college presidents prefer a more democratic sharing of responsibility, work, and power, if Truman is to be believed, this may not be an aspiration worth pursuing. When the leadership ignores or works to suppress other minority views, it may become dysfunctional and a detriment to effectiveness. Barring this eventuality, "active minorities" are a normal structural condition.

Nevertheless, because legislative effectiveness is built on the degree of precision and influence, it is reasonable to expect that consensus such as exists in State E coupled with the enthusiastic active minority found in other case-study states, but particularly in State B, will yield the most gratifying legislative results.

"Economic, Political, and Educational Constraints"

Interest groups will influence policy effectively to the extent that their operating strategy distinguishes between variables that can be manipulated and those that cannot. All other things being equal in terms of association characteristics, the leadership must read the policy maps well to arrive at their de-

sired goals. Constraints vary from state to state. The comments that follow illustrate the kinds of challenges state associations face and describe some skillful responses to these challenges.

In a depressed economy, proposals that save money are popular. According to the state asso-

65

ciation executive in State B, "aid to independent colleges as a means of relieving the tax burden became the theme song successfully used by legislators supporting the independents at a time when this single-industry state was experiencing economic recession."

Likewise, in a depressed economy, bills that lock the state into costs that escalate over time are not popular. For this reason, the State B association accommodated to the the economic circumstances and successfully lobbied for tuition assistance in the form of a flat grant to students rather than a grant based on a percentage of the annual subsidy the state awards per student to state institutions.

In State A the capital grants proposals presented by the state association for renovation and construction of independent colleges have always been fully funded by the state legislature. As the state's economic fortunes expand and contract, the executive director skillfully estimates the amount that the treasury can accommodate and works with association members to develop and carry out a long range plan that fairly accommodates each institution and then propitiously proposes requests to the legislature that suit the current budget limitations.

Many state constitutions have contained or do contain barriers to aid to independent colleges that must be removed before legislation can be passed. Prior to 1974, the constitution in State F prohibited aid in grant

form to private organizations and to religious groups or organizations, but it did not prohibit loans. The initial legislation proposed by the state association, and passed, was the tuition assistance loan plan designed to give "loans" to students attending independent colleges. The loans would be repaid in units of academic accomplishment rather than in dollars. Before money was appropriated under the bill, the attorney general successfully challenged the constitutionality of the definition of the term "loan" as it was being applied under this law, arguing that the legislation, in fact, provided grants to students attending independent colleges. When the loan strategy failed, the state association decided to move to amend the constitution to allow grants to independent colleges on the basis of the service of these institutions to the state. While the constitutional amendment easily gained legislative approval, the likelihood of citizen approval at the polls was less certain. A professional polling organization, hired to determine the kind of campaign that would be most effective, found that while the population was generally unfamiliar with the issue, they were not opposed to aid or to a constitutional amendment. A low-profile campaign using letters from college personnel to students, alumnae and friends, appeals to civic groups for support brought victory at the polls in November, 1974. A similar strategy was successfully used to defeat a constitutional challenge to aid raised in State B in 1978 against the tuition assist-

ance legislation.

A third barrier to support is that created by state institutions which subscribe to what one state association executive calls the "finite pie" theory. The theory rests on the belief that any aid given to independent colleges is cut from the higher education pie and represents a loss of aid to the state institutions.³⁹

There is a difference of opinion among state association executives regarding the degree to which policy constraints -- that is, those variables that are not subject to direct alteration through policy changes -- affect policy output. Some state association executives attribute failure to gain approval for proposed policies to these factors that they view as uncontrollable. Others argue that this is a defeatist attitude. They believe skillful and energetic application of appropriate strategy, coupled with good research, leadership, and a cohesive organization, will minimize the strength of these constraints and provide effective avenues to passage of aid legislation. Not surprisingly, those interviewed who are members of this second group work in the states where independent colleges enjoy the greatest amount of state aid and are firm believers in interest group activity as the most effective approach to policy development.

Because policy analysis is not a laboratory science, the policy analyst cannot experiment-

tally test the accuracy of these two viewpoints. Instead, judgments must be made on the basis of real life observations. Recognizing the limitations of conclusions drawn on the basis of observations that are not exactly comparable, the policy analyst, evaluating influences on state aid to independent colleges, can still support the notion that constraints are secondary to interest group activity.

Table V represents a graphic summary of the case studies. The display is not intended to suggest a rank order for the six states. Ranking by category would distort the analysis since performance in one area in a state may be a function of performance in another area. Also, ratings do not control for the effect of external factors in the shaping of strategy, tactics, and leadership roles. Despite these limitations, the table does organize the case-study information in a fashion that summarizes the analysis and offers an organizational approach for extending the analysis to other states.

As noted earlier, credibility and information ratings are uniform for the six states. These ratings are based on responses of college presidents and legislators to interview questions. Though a comparison of the research effort showed variation in information quality and quantity among the states, in each state interview responses rated the associations as good information providers having a high degree of credibility.

The other category ratings support findings in the literature on interest group activity that policy output, not legislator attitude, is the measure of group effectiveness. The four states having the highest aid levels per FTE student are states exhibiting combinations of powerful strategy, a strong executive

director, unity of purpose, and extensive policy goals. It appears to be the combination of performance categories that affects policy output, and while these combinations will have similarities from state to state, it is their uniqueness that makes ranking difficult and descriptive analysis useful.

Table 7

CATEGORICAL RATINGS OF THE CASE STUDY STATES

(States are listed according to the level of FTE aid--
from highest to lowest)

State*	Information Resources Credibility	Strategy		Leadership	Cohesion	Achieved Policy Goals
		Direct	Indirect			
State E	Good	Strong	Moderate	Semi-Autonomous	Moderate	Broad
State B	Good	Strong	Strong	Autonomous	Moderate	Broad
State A	Good	Strong	Moderate	Semi-Autonomous	Moderate	Broad
State C	Good	Strong	Moderate	Autonomous	Moderate	Moderate
State F	Good	Strong	Weak	Semi-Autonomous	Strong	Limited
State D	Good	Moderate	Weak	Limited Autonomy	Weak	Limited

Strategy: Strong - Multiple tactics used constantly
Moderate - Fewer tactics used periodically
Weak - Very limited single tactic effort

Leadership: Autonomous - Director makes and receives support for policy recommendations
Semi-Autonomous - Director makes recommendation, support not assured
Limited Autonomy - Executive committee exercises control over policy recommendations

Cohesion: Strong - Unity of purpose, no apparent dissension, large participatory majority, little apathy
Moderate - Unity of purpose, little dissension, limited participation
Weak - Obvious dissension, limited participation

Policy Goals: Broad - Many programs, high level of aid
Moderate - Two or three programs, moderate aid level
Limited - One or two major programs, lowest aid level

*States are listed according to the FTE aid level from highest to lowest.

A Summary Assessment of Group Impact and Discussion of Future Directions

In recent years competition resulting from growth of the public system of higher education, increased energy costs, and double-digit inflation have threatened the welfare of independent colleges. Political action has been a significant part of the multifaceted independent college response to these challenges. Throughout American history, public responsibility for higher education has been exercised primarily at the state level. Since the exercise of this responsibility has affected the stability of independent colleges, it is not surprising that in 39 states these colleges have organized to appeal to state governments for assistance. What appears remarkable is that the number of states having interest groups doubled in the years from 1972 to 1978 and the level of state aid to independent colleges increased by 60 percent between 1976 and 1978.

This study examined the relationship between these two facts from two perspectives. A summary of a cross-sectional analysis comparing the influence of socioeconomic, political, education, and interest group factors on state aid for independent colleges was discussed. Case studies of six states looked at how interest groups operate to evaluate the relationship between interest group activity and state policy decisions affecting independent colleges.

The results of the analyses support the basic assumptions of the study. Interest groups do influence policy decisions that affect independent colleges. Policy decisions regarding state aid to independent colleges cannot be fully understood without considering the impact of these special groups. And, the degree and kind of interest group effort is linked to the amount of state aid independent colleges enjoy.

Categories in group theory literature that describe group effectiveness were used to organize data for case study analysis. Six states were examined using information drawn from state association presidents, and legislators. The analysis departed from the literature by evaluating group effectiveness in terms of policy output rather than according to perceptions policymakers have of group strength, integrity, and influence. The information derived from the case-study analysis linked group operations such as lobbying strategies, role of group leadership, and level of cohesion to policy decisions on the level of aid to independent colleges. The results suggest that an effective state association should have energetic, experienced, respected leaders, a membership that is unified in its support of group policies, and should employ a wide range of direct and indirect lobbying tactics targeted to persuade key legislators and win adequate votes.

A high credibility rating is a prerequisite to effective persuasive interaction with legislators and was found to exist in the six case-study states. Each interest group functions as a resource for information, but the levels of research performance vary and affect the degree of support legislators award to independent colleges.

If membership in the state association is the criterion for measuring level of cohesion, the level is high in most states. However, in five of the six case-study states, groups are motivated to act by what Truman labels "the active minority."⁴⁰ The active minority establishes policy goals and develops and executes strategy for accomplishing those goals. In four of the states, internal conflict is not evident and the majority assumes an acquiescent, apathetic posture while reaping benefits equal to those of the active members.

Internal conflict is evident in the case-study state awarding the lowest aid per FTE student, suggesting an apathetic majority is preferable to open conflict. Limited policy goals characterize the state where neither conflict nor an "active minority" were found. Though this state association has achieved its policy goals, it ranks fifth in the group of six. Clearly, internal conflict is not desirable, but a high degree of unity maintained at the expense of ambitious policy goals may be less preferable than control by an "active minority" seeking maximum policy

gains.

The work experience of state association executives in the case-study states shows professional educators dominating the field, but lobbying experience is valuable. Evaluation of leadership styles in these states suggests that executive directors are most effective when they display commitment to the independent college cause, defend that cause with appropriate data, pursue policy goals energetically, and enjoy adequate autonomy within the state association.

Effective vote-getting strategies in the case-study states include direct and indirect lobbying techniques targeted at key legislators. Direct lobbying appeared most successful in case-study states where lobbyists maintained constant contact with policymakers, showed evidence of concern and respect for decision-makers, and presented good information in support of reasonable legislative proposals. The most effective proposals were clearly linked to independent college needs and services they provide the state.

Indirect lobbying techniques used effectively in the case-study states include publicly linking prominent state citizens who serve on independent college boards of trustees to the independent college cause, demonstrating accountability by sending college annual reports to legislators, and introducing policymakers to the contributions of independent colleges by inviting them to teach, speak, or

receive honors on college campuses. The evidence suggests that the most effective groups are those that go beyond execution of a consistent direct lobbying effort to organize and maintain an indirect lobbying effort as well.

Interest groups representing higher education on the national level have formed coalitions for lobbying purposes knowing that consensus is essential to achieving goals. Only one state association is a participant in a similar coalition at the state level. Though this model has not been imitated, the fact that this state ranks third for aid per FTE student nationwide suggests that cooperation is a mode for group action that can be effective in winning legislative support for independent colleges.

Group effectiveness in the case-study states appears linked to a combination of interlocking conditions that include credibility, group cohesion, good lead-

ership, and strategy that fits the political climate. Individual commitment to preservation of a strong independent college system, emphasis on achieving goals rather than bemoaning constraints, and an investment of time, intelligence, and money in the state association are also characteristics that describe high aid-level states.

Throughout American history, interest groups have been viewed with suspicion and fear in many quarters. While these groups are recognized as useful information sources, they are also thought to serve specific interests of the corporate minority and other groups that can persuade through economic pressure at the expense of the individual citizen and the general welfare. Theodore Lowi, a prominent political scientist, voices strong concern over the phenomenon of interest group liberalism which he defines as a new public philosophy that seeks to solve problems of public authority by defining them away.

Interest-group liberalism seems to justify power and to end the crisis of public authority by avoiding law and by parceling out to private parties the power to make public policy. A most maladaptive political formula, it will inevitably exacerbate rather than end the crisis even though its short run effects seem to be those of consensus and stabilization.⁴¹

While the analysis discussed in this study statistically supports Lowi's view that interest groups have an impact, it does not suggest that a "maladaptive

formula" is being employed to solve problems of public authority. On the contrary, the impact of interest groups representing independent colleges on state

policies serving those institutions suggests that a balance of authority can be restored when public authority in the guise of state institutions of higher education begins to threaten the stability of private interests.

According to democratic theory — or, more precisely, liberal theory — governments function to serve the needs of the people from whom they derive their authority. Balancing the competing demands of citizens is a part of that function. Interest groups provide a vehicle for organizing and mediating citizen demands and to that extent assist policymakers to be more responsive to the electorate. Policymakers are challenged to determine the legitimacy of group demands. The criteria legislators use to judge legitimacy affect a

group's impact and should guide its strategy.

As discussed earlier, legislators evaluate groups representing independent colleges according to their credibility, service to the state, and the appropriateness of their demands for aid. The accomplishments of the coalition representing higher education in one of the case-study states suggests that interest groups can function in a variety of ways. In this state, higher education groups resolve conflicts before they approach policymakers. A coalition that coordinates demands of a number of constituencies allows government to limit the exercise of authority, a notion which is appropriate in a self-governing system of government.

"Guidelines for State Governments"

Results of this study strongly suggest that policymakers are influenced by interest groups representing independent colleges. Policymakers interviewed for this study consider these groups reliable information sources and the needs they promote legitimate. Two challenges facing higher education may alter the way policymakers respond to those needs.

First of all, enrollments are expected to decline leaving empty desks in both state and independent schools. Secondly,

current unemployment owing to an economic recession is depleting state income. These circumstances are likely to heighten tensions and intensify the lobbying effort. This study suggests that policymakers have responded favorably to credible well-prepared appeals by independent colleges in the past. Because the percentage of higher education dollars allocated to independent colleges is small, most state associations believe they will not lose aid; however, they are concerned about the need to increase aid levels as a means of keeping pace with rising costs and

competition.

These challenges may lead policymakers to adopt new positions regarding support for higher education. While policymakers interviewed praise independent higher education, their views regarding state aid to private colleges vary. The unresolved question is what level of aid converts a private institution into a public one. The way this ques-

tion is answered is sure to affect the way policymakers respond to the challenges just discussed and affect the future of the dual system of higher education in the states.

The Carnegie Council has offered one view on the public/private distinction that may be useful. The Carnegie Council study, The States and Private Higher Education recommends that:

State aid to private institutions should not reach such levels and take such forms that they become more public than private in their operations. We suggest that a state subsidy amounting to about 50 percent of the educational subsidy per student in comparable public institutions may be a reasonable maximum.⁴²

The fact that no state approaches the 50 percent ceiling the Carnegie Council cites might ease the minds of concerned policymakers. Analysis of the aid rationales employed in the case-study states suggests three guidelines state governments might consider when making aid-level decisions. Aid levels should be proportionate (1) to

the service independent colleges provide state citizens and local communities; (2) to the contribution independent colleges make as a resource for state economic growth and productivity; and (3) to the tax benefit the state receives by being relieved of its responsibility to provide higher education opportunities to all qualified citizens.

"The Road Ahead for State Associations"

The clearest implications evolving from this study are those affecting independent colleges and the groups representing them. The policy development model summarized herein demon-

strates that state association work does affect aid levels and that the degree of impact is influenced by group effort when group spending is the measure of effort. This analysis suggests

that higher group spending earns more state dollars for independent colleges.

On the basis of the findings, interest groups might evaluate their level of dues assessment in relation to the level of aid they are receiving. No doubt, regardless of the aid level, some state associations are assessing the maximum dues that members can afford. In some states the aid level may be the maximum the state can afford. However, there are state associations that might successfully expand their policy goals if they put increased resources to work to achieve those goals. The results of this study support increases to the level of effort. As they consider dues increases and expanded policy goals, college presidents should weigh the returns of increased dues to state associations against expected returns from other fundraising efforts. The risks attached to a decision to increase dues are lessened by the fact that state associations can look at the operations, needs, political circumstances of state associations they wish to imitate as a gauge for developing their own plan of action. This comparative approach might be particularly advantageous for colleges that are considering establishing a state association and for members of state associations that are currently inactive.

While it is true on the whole that the state associations having the largest budgets achieve higher aid levels, con-

cluding that this is the basis of group success would be an oversimplification of the case. For example, one association spent \$117,203 in 1978-79, and the aid level in that state per FTE student was \$217. Another state association spent \$89,650 in the same year, but the aid level per FTE student was \$609.43. Case study analysis suggests that higher aid levels are achieved when dollars are spent building unity and consensus among members, employing qualified energetic personnel, and lobbying in a manner that convinces policymakers that independent colleges are worthy of support.

Cohesion, leadership, and access to policymakers are interlocking factors affecting group success. The quality of the performance of a group in one area is affected by the quality of effort in the other two. Assuming that the six state associations analyzed here are typical, one would conclude that groups seeking to improve their level of effectiveness should review all aspects of their operations. The case studies suggest that some group members are reluctant to lobby cooperatively for state aid with the same institutions with whom they compete for students and private funds. The groups studied that have established an adequate level of cohesion have overcome this fear. Members of these groups recognize that the return individual institutions enjoy on their efforts corresponds to the level of collective effort of the group. Cohesion will improve and reap benefits to the degree that college presidents understand the

relationship of individual returns to collective effort and to the extent that apathetic and reluctant group members are encouraged to acknowledge that relationship by becoming active group participants.

A successful collective effort should be linked to realistic expectations and an effective strategy for meeting those expectations. Analysis of leadership roles and styles in case-study states suggests that defining expectations and developing strategy are tasks that are best performed by the executive director. Evaluating the roles and performances of executive directors in the states studied leads one to conclude that state associations should employ executive directors who are energetic, have good experience in politics and higher education, and are committed to achieving legislative goals. The recommendations of executive directors should carry significant weight and these leaders should enjoy considerable autonomy in the area of strategy implementation. The executive director is the principal link between the association and the policymakers. Clearly, the person filling that position should be carefully chosen and accorded the power and trust appropriate to the assignment.

Comparison of strategies employed by the case-study interest groups offers no clear-cut list of techniques for achieving adequate access to policymakers. Effective techniques may vary from state to state, but certain

operational guidelines should not. For example, presentation of proposals and information should be timely. Content of reports and discussions should be accurate and relevant and thereby promote credibility. Contact with policymakers should be constant and purposeful, not wasteful and annoying. While different techniques may be used effectively by different groups, state associations might be guided in their choice of strategies by the knowledge that the most effective case-study states use a wide range of direct and indirect approaches to policymakers. These approaches are designed to illustrate the importance and value to the state of independent colleges and to demonstrate respect and appreciation for policymakers.

One method by which state associations can improve the quality of their performance in these areas is to capitalize on opportunities to share information, strategies, and other trade secrets. The State Association Executive Council (SAEC) which is an organization within NAICU, and the State-National Information Network, a research arm of NIICU, offer opportunities for such sharing that are still in the developmental stages.

In the near future, state associations can expect to face new challenges related to persuading legislators to support the independent college cause. Information requests from state legislators in two case-study states discussed earlier suggest that state associations are going to be call-

ed on more frequently to present sophisticated rate-of-return and economic impact studies in addition to logical arguments justifying aid requests. Only a few state associations have engaged in this kind of research. Anticipated enrollment declines and growing budget constraints in the states, coupled with increased demands by policymakers for accountability demonstrated by data, suggest that interest groups should evaluate this aspect of their group operations and improve their research capabilities if necessary.

This study demonstrates a relationship between interest group effort and state aid to independent colleges. In the near future, state governments will face difficult decisions affecting higher education. The results of this analysis and the future prospects for higher education in the states suggest that interest groups can be a useful force for improving the stability of independent colleges and for giving their needs and contributions public recognition. For these reasons, independent colleges can gain from regarding the state association as an effective vehicle for state support.

REFERENCES

1 "State Financial Support to Independent College Students, 1976-77, 1978-79 (Washington, D.C.: State-National Information Network-National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, SNIN-NAICU, February, 1979), M.M. Chambers Report on State Spending for Higher Education, The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 25, 1976, and October 9, 1979.

2 General Information Brochure, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C., NAICU, 1978).

3 Report of the Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1977), P. 1.

4 Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1973), P. 54.

5 "Private College Openings, Closings and Mergers 1970-78" (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1979).

6 A National Policy for Private Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1974), P. 19. The tuition gap varies noticeably from state to state. See The States and Private Higher Education, A Report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, (Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass, 1977), pp. 18-20.

7 The States and Private Higher Education, pp. 2, 31. See also Carol H. Shulman, Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974, p. 43.

8 David Breneman and Chester Finn, ed., Public Policy and Private Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978), p. 27.

9 Breneman and Finn, pp. 4-5.

10 Ibid.

11 See Breneman and Finn, Report of the Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education, and The States and Higher Education.

12 Report of the Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education, p. XI.

13 The States and Private Higher Education, p.1.

14 A longitudinal study of college student attitudes published by Alexander Astin concluded that students attending independent colleges are more satisfied with the quality of their education and its value to their personal lives and to society than their fellow students at public colleges. This report supports the argument that independent institutions offer choice and diversity not available through the public system. Alexander Astin, Four Critical Years (Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass, 1978).

15 A National Policy for Private Higher Education, pp. 27, 47.

16 The States and Private Higher Education, p. 3.

17 Breneman, p. 3.

18 Information taken from SNIN-NAICU State files, Raleigh, North Carolina, and the Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association.

19 General Brochure, National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: NCICU, 1975).

20 General Information Brochure, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: NAICU, 1978).

21 Information taken from SNIN-NAICU state files and summaries of cross-sectional data of all states, Raleigh, North Carolina.

22 State Association Executive poll, August, 1979.

23 The sixteen states included in the preliminary examination were California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

24 The areas of inquiry correspond to factors identified by group theorists such as David Truman, Robert Presthus, Harmon Ziegler and Michael Baer as factors that affect the impact of interest groups on legislators and ultimately on policy. Truman, David B. The Governmental Process, Political Interests and Public Opinion (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958). Presthus, Robert V. Elites in the Policy Process (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974). Ziegler, Harman and Baer, Michael A., Lobbying: Interaction and Influence in American State Legislatures (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1969).

25 Harmon Ziegler and Michael Baer emphasize interaction behavior in their analysis of group effectiveness. Interview questions examined interaction behavior in light of Ziegler and Baer's theories. Contrary to Ziegler and Baer's findings the state legislators rarely initiate contact with state association executives, not because they do not regard them as influential, but because they expect lobbyists to initiate contact with them and keep them informed as a matter of routine.

26 68.2 Million dollars represents total dollars listed for programs marked with an asterisk in Table IV. It does not include aid to allied health programs in States B and D nor does it include aid to "state aided" institutions in State E since these are specialized programs serving specific schools and/or professions rather than independent colleges as a whole. It is also worth noting that in 1970 state aid to independent colleges in all of the states was less than one-half of the 68.2 million dollar total.

27 Presthus, p. 170.

28 Most state associations annually supply reports to legislatures and to state association members that include the number of aid users, their need level based on family resources, and the amount of state aid not used or needed to meet the current need. These reports are recognized information sources that influence appropriation levels for state aid proposed by legislators. See Ziegler and Baer, pp. 4-14.

29 An economic impact study was scheduled for publication in State E in Spring, 1980. While no other state has engaged in formal economic impact studies, interest in such studies is increasing. A recent economic impact study was performed by a university in a medium sized city in State D and revealed a significant contribution by that university to the economic growth of the community.

30 All of these techniques are identified as typical lobbying techniques by David Truman in The Governmental Process, pp. 321-391.

31 Olson, pp. 43-65.

32 Holtzman, pp. 86-89.

33 Truman, pp. 389-391. Holtzman, pp. 86-89.

34 Presthus, p. 84.

35 Truman, p. 168.

36 Ibid.

37 Olson, pp. 23-33.

38 Truman, pp. 129-155 Holtzman, pp. 14-23.

39 Page 9 of the Chronicle of Higher Education published November 26, 1979, reports a policy statement from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities that argues that support to independent colleges threatens to affect the tuition and other student charges at public institutions. "Appropriations of Universities Out-race Inflation in 41 States," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 9, 1979, pp. 1,6.

40 Truman, David, The Governmental Process, pp. 139-155.

41 Theodore Lowi, The End of Liberalism (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1969), p. 58.

42 The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, The States and Private Higher Education, p. 65.

43 SNIN-NAICU, "Annual Fiscal Report of State Associations Representing Independent Colleges, 1978-79," and New York Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, "State Aid to Independent and State Colleges and Universities per FTE Student, 1978-79."

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Questions Asked of State Executives and College Presidents

1. What are the current policy goals of the association?
2. How are they established?
3. What constraints will affect achieving these goals?
4. How is consensus among members achieved? Describe membership participation in the association.
5. What is the role of the state executive?
 - a. Mediator who establishes and maintains consensus?
 - b. Architect of policy?
 - c. Information source?
 - d. Catalyst for action?
6. What techniques and procedures are used with the state legislature and governor to achieve policy goals?
 - a. Direct lobbying? What methods?
 - b. Indirect lobbying? What methods?
 - c. Sophisticated research analysis?
 - d. Telephone contact?
7. What is the role of the independent college president in achieving policy goals?
8. What, if any, changes in association structure do you advocate? Is the association budget adequate?
9. What is the professional experience of the state executive?

Questions Asked of State Legislators

- I. 1. Personal Background—College attended/profession/number of years in state politics.
 - Committee membership/number of years on committee.
 - Nature of district they represent; i.e., urban, suburban, rural.

II. 2. What is the position of education in the list of priorities of the state legislature?

3. How does spending for education rank proportionate to other state spending?

III. 4. What is the current state policy toward independent higher education?

5. What changes to that policy would you recommend?

6. Why should state funds be used in your state to support independent higher education?

7. What kind of aid is most appropriate in your state and why?

8. What is the strongest argument for aid to independent colleges in your state legislature? (a) Choice-diversity; (b) Relieves tax burden of taxpayer; (c) Avoids duplication of resources.

IV. 9. What role does the state association play with respect to passage of legislation affecting independent colleges?

a. Informational?

b. Direct influence based on constituency or interest group pressure?

10. Is the state association recognized as a credible representative of independent college and state educational needs? Comment.

11. How does the independent sector present its case relative to the public sector?

12. Do you initiate contact with the association or the reverse and how often do you have contact with the association?

V. 13. What is the future for the independent sector in terms of state aid? (a) Increase; (b) Decrease; (c) Status Quo.

14. What, if any, changes in association structure do you advocate? Is the association budget adequate?

15. What is the professional experience of the state executive?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sidney. The Civic Culture. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1965.
- Astin, Alexander. Four Critical Years. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Aufderheide, J. Alan. "Educational Interest Groups and the State Legislature," in State Policymaking for the Public Schools: A Comparative Analysis. Edited by Ronald F. Campbell and Tim Mazzoni. Columbus, Ohio: Educational Governor's Project, Ohio State University, 1974.
- Bentley, Arthur. The Process of Government. San Antonio, Texas: Principia Press of Trinity University, 1949.
- Breneman, David W. and Finn, Chester E. Public Policy and Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.
- The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. The States and Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The States and Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Cater, Douglass. Power in Washington. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Dahl, Robert. A Preface to Democratic Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Deakin, James. The Lobbyists. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1966.
- Dye, Thomas R. "State Legislative Politics," in Politics in the American State. Edited by Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines. 2nd ed. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1971.
- Dye, Thomas R. Politics, Economics and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

- Easton, David. The Political System. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1953.
- Education Commission of the States and National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. State Postsecondary Education Profile Handbook, 1978. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1978.
- Farkas, Suzanne. Urban Lobbying, Mayors in the Federal Arena. New York: New York University Press, 1971.
- Ferguson, Leroy C. How State Legislators View the Problem of School Needs. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1960.
- Francis, Wayne L. Legislative Issues in the Fifty States: A Comparative Analysis. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.
- Greenwald, Carol S. Group Power Lobbying and Public Policy. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Holtzman, Abraham. Interest Groups and Lobbying. New York: Macmillan Co., 1967.
- Key, Vladimir Orlando. Politics, Policies and Pressure Groups. 5th ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964.
- King, Lauriston R. The Washington Lobbyists for Higher Education. New York: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath, 1975.
- Latham, Earl. The Group Basis of Politics. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1952.
- LeBlanc, Hugh L. and Allensworth, D. Trudeau. The Politics of States and Urban Communities. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Lowi, Theodore. The End of Liberalism. New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1969.
- Mahood, H.R. Pressure Groups in American Politics. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1967.
- McFarlane, William, Howard, A.E. Dick, Chronister, Jay L. State Financial Measures Involving the Private Sector of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1974.
- Milbrath, Lester W. The Washington Lobbyists. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

- National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. A National Policy for Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974.
- Olson, Mancur. The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Presthus, Robert V. Elites in the Policy Process. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Ranney, Austin. "Parties in State Politics," in Politics in the American States. Edited by Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines. 3rd ed. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1976.
- Salisbury, Robert H. Interest Group Politics in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Scott, Andrew M. and Hunt, Margaret A. Congress and Lobbies: Image and Reality. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.
- Sharkansky, Ira and Hofferbert, Richard. "Dimensions of State Policy" in Politics in the American States. Edited by Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines. 2nd ed. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1971.
- Shulman, Carol Hernstadt. Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects. Washington, D.C: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.
- Smith, Michael P. and Tulane University Associates. Politics in America, Studies in Policy Analyses. New York: Random House, 1974.
- Truman, David B. The Governmental Process, Political Interests and Public Opinion. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.
- Wahlke, John C., Eulau, Heinz, Buchanan, William, Ferguson, Leroy C. The Legislation System. New York: J. Wiley and Sons. 1962.
- Walker, Jack. "The Difusion of Innovation among the American States," in Comparative State Politics. Edited by Donald Sprenkel. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.
- Wilson, James Q. Political Organizations. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Wirt, Frederick N. "Education Politics and Policies," in Politics in the American States. Edited by Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines. 3rd Ed. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1976.

Zeigler, Harmon. Interest Groups in American Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Zeigler, Harmon and Baer, Michael A. Lobbying: Interaction and Influence in American State Legislatures. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1969.

Zeigler, Harmon and Von Dalen, Hendrick. "Interest Groups in the States," in Politics in the American States. Edited by Herbert Jacobs and Kenneth Vines. 2nd ed. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1971.

Zisk, Betty H. American Political Interest Groups: Readings in Theory and Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1969.

Journals

Booms, Bernard, and Halldorson, J. "The Politics of Redistribution: A Reformulation." APSR, 67 (September 1973): 924-933.

Carmines, Edward G. "The Mediating Influence of State Legislatures on the Linkage between Interparty Competition and Welfare Policies." APSR, 68 (September 1974): 1118-1124.

Celler, Emanuel. "Pressure Groups in Congress." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 319 (September 1958): 1-10.

Dawson, Richard and Robinson, James. "Interparty Competitive Economic Variables and Welfare Policies in American States." Journal of Politics, 25 (May 1963): 265-289.

Dye, Thomas R. "Malapportionment and Public Policy in the States." Journal of Politics, 27 (August 1965): 586-607.

Dye, Thomas R. "Government, Structure, Urban Environment and Education Policy." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 11 (August 1967): 353-380.

Eulau, Heinz. "Lobbyists: The Wasted Profession." Public Affairs Quarterly, 28 (Spring 1964): 27-38.

Froman, Lewis A. "Some Effects of Interest Group Strength in State Politics," APSR, 60 (December 1966): 952-962.

- Fry, Brian R. and Wirten, Richard F. "The Politics of Redistribution." APSR, 64 (June 1970): 508-522.
- Gable, Richard. "Interest Groups as Policy Shapers." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 319 (September 1958): 84-93.
- Garceau, Oliver. "Interest Group Theory in Political Research." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 319 (September 1958): 104-112.
- Hofferbert, Richard. "The Relation between Public Policy and Some Structural and Environmental Variables," APSR, 61 (March 1966): 73-82.
- Latham, Earl. "The Group Basis of Politics, Notes for a Theory," APSR, 66 (June 1952): 376-397.
- Luttbeg, Norman R. "Classifying the American States: An Empirical Attempt to Identify Internal Variations," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 15 (November 1971): 703-721.
- Patterson, Samuel C. "The Role of the Lobbyist: The Case of Oklahoma." Journal of Political Science, 25 (February 1963): 72-92.
- Salisbury, Robert. "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 13 (February 1969): 1-31.
- Sharkansy, Ira. "Government Expenditures and Public Services in the American States," APSR, 61 (December 1967): 1066-1077.
- Turner, Henry. "Legislative Attitudes toward Interest Groups," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 2 (November 1967): 489-504.
- Turner, Henry. A. "How Pressure Groups Operate." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 319 (September 1958): 63-73.
- Wahlke, John C., Buchanan, William, Eulau, Heinz, and Ferguson, Leroy C. "American State Legislators: Role Orientations toward Pressure Groups," Journal of Politics, 22 (February 1960): 203-227.
- Weber, Ronald and Shaffer, William R. "Public Opinion and American State Policy-Making," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 4 (November 1972): 683-692.

Zeigler, Harmon. "The Effects of Lobbying: A Comparative Assessment," Western Political Quarterly, 22 (1969): 122-140.

Ziegler, Harmon and Baer, Michael A. "The Recruitment of Lobbyists and Legislators," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 12 (1968): 493-502.

Government Publications

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, A Census Portrait by State, 1974. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Demographic Social and Economic Characteristics: Profile of States: Spring 1976. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, State Government Finances in 1977. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, The National Commission of Financing Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Pamphlets and Monographs and Newspaper Articles

"Appropriations of Universities Outpace Inflation in 41 States." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 October 1979, pp. 1,6.

Coleman, James S. "Policy Research in the Social Sciences." Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1972, pp. 1-23.

Education Commission of the States. Report of the Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1977.

"Higher Education Lobbyists: Kids in a Candy Shop." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 29 October 1979, pp. 19.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. General Information Brochure. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. General Brochure. Washington, D.C.: 1975.

"States Adding \$25 - Million to Aid Private-College Students -- Simultaneously They Are Reducing Support for Those Enrolled in Public Institutions, Washington Programs Blamed by Some." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 5 November 1979, p. 13.

"State Appropriations Up 24 Percent in Two Years." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 25 October 1976, p. 9.

Unpublished Materials

New York Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. State Aid to Independent Colleges and State Universities per FTE Student in 1978-79. Presented at the State Association Executive Council Meeting. Washington, D.C., February 1979.

Olliver, James, "Report on State Legislative Activity 1979 Session Including Trends in Appropriations 1976-1980." Report presented to the State Association Executive Council, Chicago, July 1979.

State Association Executive Conference Reports--State National Information Network--National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. State Association Executive Conference Reports, 1978. Raleigh, North Carolina: 1978.

State-National Information Network-National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. Annual Fiscal Report of State Association Executive Council Members, 1976-77, 1977-78, 1978-79. Raleigh, North Carolina.